

REMARKS**I. Examiner Interview**

Applicant's attorneys appreciate the Examiner's courtesy in speaking with them on October 2, 2007, regarding the outstanding office action. The interview included discussion of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner, and the Oikawa reference (Japan Patent No. 05167850A). No agreement was reached and Applicants submit that the comments below reflect the substance of the interview.

II. Objection to Title

The title of the invention was objected to by the Examiner. Applicant amends the title, and respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

III. Objection to Drawings

The drawing sheet with Figure 5, filed on August 27, 2003, was objected to by the Examiner. Applicant submits a replacement drawing sheet for Figure 5 in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

IV. Status

Claims 1, 11, 18, and 28 have been amended and no new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. Claims 1-37 are currently pending.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oikawa (Japan Patent No. 05167850A). Amended independent Claims 1 and 11 recite that the predetermined pattern of pixel values has an undesirable toner placement. Similarly, amended independent Claims 18 and 28 recite that the predetermined patterns have an undesirable toner placement. Oikawa does not teach this feature. Instead, Oikawa discloses thirty-two kinds of cruciform memory patterns stored in advance. (Oikawa, abstract; ¶¶ 0013-0014; Figure 1). The cruciform memory patterns are all possible combinations of the five pixels making up the cruciform memory pattern. (Oikawa, ¶¶ 0013-0014; Figure 1). Oikawa does not teach or suggest a predetermined pattern of pixels values having an undesirable toner placement, as recited in Claims 1, 11, 18, and 28. The thirty-two kinds of cruciform memory patterns in Oikawa do not have an undesirable toner placement because

they merely consist of all patterns that are possible in a five-pixel cross. Therefore, Claims 1, 11, 18, and 28 are patentable for at least the above reasons.

Amended independent Claim 1 also recites that the first processor is adapted to send the predetermined pcode grid to a controller circuit for printing instead of the grid of pixels. Similarly, amended independent Claim 11 recites printing the predetermined pcode grid instead of the grid of pixels. Oikawa does not teach these features. Instead, Oikawa applies a cruciform memory pattern to a graphic pattern, and then compares the memory pattern conforming to part of the graphic pattern to the memory pattern after it is moved one pixel over on part of the graphic pattern. (Oikawa, abstract; ¶¶ 0010, 0016, and 0017; Figures 2, 3, and 4). Oikawa then detects a curve part and an oblique part of a character and deforms a picture element of the graphic pattern to smooth these parts when the graphic pattern is printed. (Oikawa, abstract; ¶¶ 0026-0029). Oikawa smoothes the curve and oblique parts of a character by identifying the change in the cruciform memory pattern from when it is first applied to when it is moved one pixel over. (Oikawa, ¶¶ 0021-0025; Figure 4, 5, and 6). Oikawa does not teach or suggest sending or printing a predetermined pcode grid instead of a grid of pixels, as recited in Claims 1 and 11. Instead, Oikawa merely smoothes the “jaggy” of a curved part and an oblique part of a character. (Oikawa, ¶¶ 0028-0029). Therefore, Claims 1 and 11 are also patentable for at least the above reasons.

In addition, amended independent Claims 18 and 28 recite directing the output of an image in accordance with grid data corresponding to one of the predetermined patterns, instead of the set of received pixel data. Oikawa does not teach this feature. Instead, similar to the discussion above, Oikawa smoothes the curve and oblique parts of a character by identifying the change in the cruciform pattern from when it is first applied to when it is moved one pixel over, and smoothes the “jaggy” of a character. (Oikawa, ¶¶ 0021-0025, 0028-0029; Figure 4, 5, and 6). Oikawa does not teach or suggest directing an output of an image in accordance with grid data corresponding to one of the predetermined patterns, instead of the set of received pixel data, as recited in Claims 18 and 28. Therefore, Claims 18 and 28 are also patentable for at least the above reasons.

Dependent Claims 9, 17, 26, and 36 recite that the predetermined pattern of pixel values and its corresponding pcode grid applies to a first color and a second predetermined pattern of pixel values and its corresponding pcode grid applies to a second color. The Office Action asserts that Claims 9 and 17 are anticipated by Oikawa, specifically, paragraphs 16-18.

(Office Action, page 4). The Office Action also asserts that Claims 26 and 36 recite similar limitations as Claims 9 and 17, and rejects them on the same basis. (Office Action, page 4). Oikawa does not teach these features. Instead, the cited portion of Oikawa discloses applying a cruciform memory pattern to a graphic pattern, and then comparing the memory pattern conforming to part of the graphic pattern to the memory pattern after it is moved one pixel over on part of the graphic pattern. (Oikawa, ¶¶ 0016-0018). Oikawa does not teach or suggest that a predetermined pattern of pixel values and its corresponding pcode grid applies to a first color and a second predetermined pattern of pixel values and its corresponding pcode grid applies to a second color, as recited in Claims 9, 17, 26, and 36. Therefore, Claims 9, 17, 26, and 36 are patentable for at least this reason. Also, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-17, 19-27, and 29-37 are patentable at least because they depend from their respective allowable independent base claims.

VI. Summary

It is respectfully asserted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a further telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason C. White/

Jason C. White
Reg. No. 42,223
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200